DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 691 95 SP 011 409

AUTHOR Rostetter, David J.
TITLE Factors Affecting CBTE Program Development as Reported by Institutions and the New York State Education Department.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Teacher Education Developmental Service.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT 300-76-0034
NOTE 92p.; For related documents, see SP011 401-409 and SP011 542; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Institutional Role; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Problems; *Program Development; Role Perception; *Schools of Education; *State Departments of Education; State Standards; *State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This report is one in a series of ten documents examining the experiences of New York State in the transition from traditional to competency based teacher education. This volume presents data on institutional perceptions of problems relating to program development. Institutions of higher education and the State Education Department perceptions are reported and compared. An additional dimension of the report is an analysis of the State Education Department's proposal review process. Background, statement of the problem, and purpose of the research are discussed in an introductory section. The body of data is presented in three phases: Phase I--elements of program development; Phase II--State Education Department program review process and perceptions of elements of program development; and Phase III--comparison of these perceptions. Instrumentation and correspondence are presented in the appendices. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143641

Factors Affecting CBTE Program Development as reported by Institutions and the New York State Education Department

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

David J. Rostetter

Teacher Education Developmental Service / John Ether, Director

Spring 1976

State University of New York at Albany

SP011 109

Best Copy Available

Preface

In July 1970, Teacher Corps requested all 5th cycle programs to begin developing Competence-Based Teacher Education programs. In July 1971, Teacher Corps required that all programs funded be competence-based. Since that time, Teacher Corps has been a major force in the development, demonstration and implementation of CBTE.

In 1972, the New York State Board of Regents set, as a goal, the establishment of teacher certification that ensures possession and maintenance of demonstrated competence on the part of teachers. The movement to CBTE in New York State should be completed by 1980.

These two facts come together quite naturally.

"What can be learned from the experiences in New York State as the transition is made? What help can be provided educational leaders in all other parts of the nation as a result of the New York State experience?"

We at the State University of New York at Albany were given the opportunity to attempt a response to those questions. An inter-disciplinary group of faculty and advanced graduate students in the School of Education accepted that responsibility. This volume is one of a group written as a result of that acceptance.

The various volumes reflect the dimensions of the investigation.

A series of six volumes with the overall title of Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs, gathered extensive information from the various teacher training institutions concerning the intra-institutional approach to the state mandate. The sub-titles of the volumes indicate the wide range of concerns investigated and reported. These sub-titles are: Descriptive and Summary Report, Process Environment Factors, Organizational Change Factors, Decision Making Factors, Leadership Factors and Technical Assistance Factors.

The current volume, Factors Affecting CBTE Program Development, reports data relating to institutional perception of problems related to program development. Institution of higher education and State Education Department perceptions are reported and compared. An additional dimension of this report is an analysis of the State Education Department's proposal review process.

The research group felt that an important population was not being reported. Four teacher training institutions, each with a long history of teacher preparation, did not file a revised program with the State Education Department. What was to be learned from these? An in-depth case study was done of one of these institutions. "A Case Study in CBTE Program Development from the Perspective of Inter and Intra Organizational Conflict" is a report of those data.

The final question the research group addressed reflected a concern for that group of people seeking teacher certification but who were not affiliated with a registered program. Who are they? What preparation do they have? Data responding to these and other such questions is reported in "A Descriptive Profile of Individuals Applying for Certification Through Individual Review Procedures".

Directing and coordinating this effort has been one of the most exciting experiences of my professional life. Acknowledgements are too extensive to attempt. Suffice it to say that cooperation of faculty, students, people from so many campuses in the State, our support staff, etc., was truly phenomenal.

One exception must be made. Without the herculean efforts and high level talent of Ms. Kathy Cooke and Ms. Jenifer Whittle, this work would still be in formative stages.

It is our hope that we have, indeed, provided information to help educational leaders throughout the nation to judiciously consider CBTE and, if appropriate, to successfully implement that system.

John A. Ether
Professor of Education
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FACTORS AFFECTING CBTE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AS REPORTED BY INSTITUTIONS AND THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Introduction....1
Background....3
Statement of Problem....5
Purpose....6

PHASE I - ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Introduction....8
Purpose....8
Focus....8
Rationale....9
Research Questions....10
Methodology....11
Presentation and Analysis of Findings....12
Implications....24
Summary....27

PHASE II - STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS AND PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Background....30
Purpose....31
Research Questions....31
Methodology....32
Presentation and Analysis of Findings....35
Recommendations....46
Summary....47

PHASE III - COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Background....48
Purpose....48
Rationale....48
Research Question....49
Presentation and Analysis of Findings....49
Implications....53
Summary....58

BIBLIOGRAPHY....59

APPENDIX A
APPENDIX B
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX D
APPENDIX E

This document consists of material prepared under Contract No. 300-76-0034, National Teacher Corps.

FACTORS AFFECTING CBTE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AS REPORTED BY INSTITUTIONS AND THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTRODUCTION

This research report is one of several reports which have developed as a result of a comprehensive study of Competency Based Teacher Education (CBTE) program development in New York State. The study was conducted from September 1, 1975 and terminated on September 1, 1976. Detailed analysis and descriptions of the entire year long study are contained in Volume Number 1 "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."

Chapter One of this volume provides an introduction to the entire study for the reader. It also provides the contextual framework from which this particular study can be viewed by indicating the focus and parameters of the year long CBTE study.

As can be ascertained by the examination of Chapter One, one of the major assumptions made by the research team was that the registration of programs with the State Education Department could provide categories for the collection and analysis of data. More specifically, the State Education Department's decision to award one year or four year registration to a specific program provides the basic criteria for the categorization of data. It is one of the critical dependent variables in the comprehensive study. On this basis, the process of registering programs becomes a source of great interest in the interpretation and analysis of CBTE program development in

New York State.

A second area of interest is the perceptions of the CBTE program development process held by those involved in it in the various institutions throughout New York State. Data of this type can provide information regarding what areas of CBTE program development need further research and additional technical assistance.

A third major area of interest deals with the relationship between the institutions submitting programs and the State Education Department. Specifically, this area is concerned with a comparison of the perceptions held by State Education Department participants in the CBTE program development process, and the data obtained from institutions regarding their perceptions of the CBTE program development process.

This study attempts, in part, to address the three interest areas as generally described above. The problems of concern are:

1) The process utilized by the State Education Department to make decisions regarding program registration

2) The program proposals submitted by institutions to the State Education Department and the perceptions of these program proposals as reported by State Education staff

3) The program development process as perceived by institutions responding to the State Education Department mandate for CBTE

4) The perceptions of the CBTE program development process reported by institutions as compared with the perceptions of the CBTE program development process as perceived by State Education staff

A more specific statement of the problem areas is included in the following pages. The conceptual framework and design are also explained in more detail in the remainder of this chapter.

The study consists of three phases, each of which has a specific methodology or methodologies. The phases address different aspects of the problem areas in an attempt to gather and analyze data which will make the CBTE program development phenomena in New York State understandable and provide information regarding organizational change and program development in education.

BACKGROUND

During the past forty years much change has taken place in the regulation of teacher preparation and certification practices in New York State. Mandatory requirement of a baccalaureate degree for most public school teachers was established in 1936. In 1943, the fifth year requirement was enacted for secondary and special certificates; in 1963 this was extended to elementary certificates. Certification has been granted by the state to students successfully completing an accredited academic program.

In 1972 the New York State Board of Regents published "Education Beyond High School: the Regents Tentative Statewide

Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education." That document cited changes in the economic, cultural and educational sectors of society that necessitated a re-evaluation of teacher preparation programs. The Regents goal for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the school is:

> To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the school possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

Groundwork toward a competency-based teacher preparation program was laid in 1971 when 12 field-based trial projects dealing with program revision were sanctioned. The projects included faculty and staff from public schools and colleges and teachers in training who identified school goals, relevant teacher competencies, evidence that such competencies are influential, and training programs to develop those competencies. These trial projects were continued and became models for the institutions now involved in re-writing teacher education programs in a competency-based mode.

To implement the state-wide goal of CBTE, a series of regional meetings were held in 1973, outlining new procedures and standards for state certification. A time line for program registration was established, beginning in 1976 for certain elementary certifications, concluding in 1980 with a competency based program for school administrators.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What were the processes involved in institutions of higher education and their consortia as they responded to a New York State mandate for CBTE?

The February, 1975 deadline for program registration in elementary education, special education of the deaf and blind, and speech-hearing education marked the first mandated change toward Competency-Based Teacher Training in New York State. One hundred and forty-three teacher training programs in sixty institutions were required to respond to this deadline by submitting teacher training programs to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification for program registration. Due to the wide variety of institutional settings and characteristics respresented by this group of teacher training institutions, responses to the state mandate took varying forms. Despite these differences in institutional settings and characteristics, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was confronted with the problem of applying and developing standardized criteria upon which to base decisions regarding program registration. It is from these two phenomena; 1) the variations in institutional settings and characteristics, and; 2) the Division's state-wide mandate and standardized criteria for program development and registration, that the problem which this study addresses emanates.

This study concerns itself with both parts of this problem area. These two parts are: 1) the process of developing CBTE programs in sixty institutions in New York State with varying

institutional settings and differing organizational, social and physical characteristics; and, 2) the State Education Department's process of developing and applying standardized criteria for the registration of these programs.

PURPOSE

Due to the complex nature of the study and the time frame for the conduct of the study, the study consists of three distinct parts (phases). While the purpose and methodology of each phase differs, the information yielded addresses the same problem area. The purpose for the entire study is to:

1) identify critical problems in CBTE program development as perceived by participants from institutions throughout New York State

2) identify critical problems in CBTE program development as perceived by State Education Department staff in program proposals reviewed for registration decisions

3) document the process utilized by the State Education Department in making decisions regarding program registration

4) compare the data obtained from problems one and two above in order to determine if there were differing perceptions of the CBTE program development process between State Education Department staff and institutional staff.

The three phases address the problem areas mentioned above. Phase I, entitled "Institutional Needs Assessment" relates to Purpose Number One. Phase II attempts to answer the questions raised in Purposes Two and Three. Phase III attempts to compare the collected data as indicated in Purpose Four.

The presentation of the study follows.

PHASE I

ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

This phase of the study focused upon collecting data concerning areas of difficulty in CBTE program development as perceived by institutions responding to the state-wide mandate Area of difficulty was utilized as the index by which perceptions of program development could be identified. The "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals" (Appendix A) was developed by the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, and delineated the basic program areas to be covered in CBTE program development. This document was utilized by the researcher as a framework for the collection of data and the presentation of findings for this study. The Format identifies program content areas and specific aspects of program which were to be included in program proposals. On the basis of this document, questionnaires and categories of analysis were identified.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this phase of the study is to: identify areas of program development which institutions perceived as causing difficulty in the process of CBTE program development.

FOCUS

The focus for this section of the study consists of teacher education institutions throughout the state which were required

to submit Teacher Education Program Proposals to the State Education Department on or before February 1, 1975. There were sixty institutions in this category. Fifty-six institutions submitted program proposals. Four did not as of the initiation of this study and were therefore not included in the study. (A case study report is available on one institution which did not submit a program.)

As indicated earlier, this section of the study will focus on the identification of components of program development which were perceived as more difficult or less difficult by institutions responding to the state mandate for CBTE.

RATIONALE

The rationale for the study is based on two important assumptions:

1) The "Format for Submission of Program Proposals" developed by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification identifies the fundamental elements of CBTE program development

2) The degree of difficulty accorded to each element of CBTE program development by the institutions surveyed is one accurate indication of the perceptions of CBTE program development held by institutions surveyed.

The conceptualization for this phase of the study is built upon these assumptions. The utilization of the "Format" provides the linkage between the expectations of the State Education Department and the institutions' attempts to meet those expectations. The degree of difficulty index derived from responses to a research questionnaire provides

a means of identifying elements of program development and the insitutions' perception of them. More specifically, the State Education Department provided the format and its identification of program elements. The institutions categorized the program elements through an index of degree of difficulty.

Another aspect of the rationale for the study concerns the State Education Department decision to grant one year or four year registration. On the basis of these two categories the respondents are divided into two distinct groups: those receiving one year registration and those receiving four year registration. The perceptions of the program elements of both groups are compared on the basis of these two categories. This will permit the analysis of each group's perceptions of difficulty in developing a program and the comparison of each group according to registration granted. This will be done in order to determine if the State Education Department's decisions regarding program registration accurately reflected the perceptions of the institutions regarding program development. A presentation of the research questions, which will more clearly delineate the scope and direction of the study, follows.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. According to degree of difficulty:

   A. How do respondents perceive elements of

program development?

B. How do respondents whose programs received one year registration perceive elements of program development?

C. How do respondents whose programs received four year registration perceive elements of program development?

II. According to degree of difficulty, what is the relationship between the respondent's perceptions of elements of program development whose programs received one year registration, and the respondents' perceptions of elements of program development whose programs received four year registration?

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was constructed using the "Format for Program Proposal Submission" as a framework (Appendix B). The questionnaire was mailed to the "Teacher Education Contact Person" in each institution which submitted a CBTE program proposal to the State Education Department (fifty-six institutions). In most instances this individual was either the Dean of the School of Education or the Chairperson of the Education Department. In cases where an institution had neither a Dean or Chairperson, the contact person was the individual responsible for the development of the program proposal (i.e. faculty member, Chairperson of the Policy Board, etc.)

The questionnaire was divided into four sections: planning of program, implementation of proposed program, requirements to be met by candidate to be recommended for certification and

program design. Within each section respondents indicated on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = little difficulty, 5 = much difficulty) the degree of difficulty encountered with certain elements of program development. There were a total of 29 items in the questionnaire.

The questionnaires were returned in a stamped, self-addressed envelope to the researcher. The questionnaires were then tabulated according to the categories established in the research questions. This tabulation included:

1. means of degree of difficulty rating for each element of program development for the entire group
2. means of degree of difficulty for each element of program development for one year registrants
3. means of degree of difficulty for each element of program development for four year registrants
4. ranking of means of degree of difficulty for both groups
5. computation of correlation between rankings as indicated by both groups

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This segment of the report is divided into several sections. Section One will present data regarding the response rates. The succeeding sections will address each of the four Research Questions.

Section One. Response Rates.

Fifty-six institutions were sent questionnaires. These fifty-six institutions were responsible for 143 teacher

training programs. Of these fifty-six, forty returned useable questionnaires (71.4%). Of seventeen institutions with programs registered for four years with the State Education Department, fifteen responded (88%). Of thirty-nine one year registrations, twenty-five institutions returned useable questionnaires (64%).

TABLE 1

Response Rates of Participating Institutions

Totals:	Institutions	Returns	Percentage
Population	56	40	71.4
One Year Registration	39	25	64.0
Four Year Registration	17	15	88.0

Section Two. Research Question Number I.

I. According to degree of difficulty:

A. How do respondents perceive elements of program development?

An item-by-item presentation of the elements of program development follows which presents the mean of the entire group on the degree of difficulty index.

The numbers at the right represent the mean of the total responses and are an index of the degree of difficulty. The responses were based on a scale of 1 = least difficulty, 5 = most difficulty. The formula for computing this index is $\frac{fx}{n}$ = mean degree of difficulty.

TABLE 2

Mean Responses of Degree of Difficulty of Elements of Program Development, all respondents

A. Planning of Program

1. Agreement on nature of CBTE	2.8
2. Agreement on rationale for program	2.3
3. Agreement on program objectives	2.2
4. Inclusion of professional organizations and staff	2.4
5. Cooperation of professional organizations and staff	2.4
6. Inclusion of school district (i.e. superinten. princ., etc.)	2.2
7. Cooperation of school district personnel	2.2
8. Problems of a political nature (i.e. union disputes, etc.)	3.1
9. Economic aspects of program development	3.4
10. Utilization and availability of time devoted to program development	3.8
11. Utilization and availability of space.	1.8
12. Problems in management of resources and personnel	2.7
13. Problems encountered which fall into area of Human Relations	2.3

B. Implementation of Proposed Program

1. Cooperation of institutions and agencies	2.3
2. Coordination of activities of institutions and agencies	2.3
3. Description and designation of roles of institutions and agencies	2.4
4. Description designation and meeting of responsibilities of institutions and agencies	2.5

C. Requirements to be met by Candidate to be Recommended for Certification

1. Description and definition of skills necessary for competence	2.5
2. Description and definition of knowledge necessary	2.3
3. Description and definition of attitudes necessary	3.0
4. Assessment of skills necessary	3.6
5. Assessment of knowledge necessary	3.1
6. Assessment of attitudes necessary	3.9

D. Program Design

1. Determination of specific goals of the preparatory programs	2.5
2. Rationale for decisions on the use of these specific goals	2.4
3. Determination of what means will be used to prove attainment of these goals.	3.2
4. Determination of adequacy of goals and modification and revision of goals	3.2
5. Development of mechanisms for evaluation of program goals	3.0
6. Development of mechanisms to determine program effectiveness	3.7

Scale 1 = least difficulty
5 = most difficulty

ANALYSIS

The area most frequently identified by institutions as presenting the greatest difficulty was that of assessment. This is true of all types of assessment relative to program design. The two areas of assessment which caused the most difficulty were: 1) assessment of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary (attitudes being the most difficult) (items C 4, 6), and; 2) assessment (evaluation) of program effectiveness. (item D 6)

The next area causing difficulty was that of economic concerns (item A 9), with most institutions indicating this category as being difficult. Utilization of time (item A 10) was considered a function of economic concerns, since no funds were available to relieve participants of other duties in order to participate more freely in program development work. Other areas measured by the questionnaire which were reported frequently as causing difficulty were: problems of a political nature, utilization and availability of time by personnel, and modification of program goals.

It should be pointed out that this instrument measures relative degree of difficulty per item. What some respondents consider to be very difficult, others may not. This need not be due to the real difficulty rating, but rather due to what individuals perceive as being difficult. Some individuals might consider economic problems as insurmountable while others consider them part of the daily operation. The same is true of the entire instrument.

It is the researcher's contention that these perceptions of difficulty, as relative as they might be across the group, are critical to determining the "nature" of CBTE program development. It is how the individuals involved in the process perceive program development which is of importance to understanding the phenomena. It was these perceptions which determined how the program proposals were designed and developed. Therefore, it is the perceptions which give an accurate indication of the process.

I. According to the degree of difficulty:

B. How do respondents whose programs received one year registration perceive elements of program development?

As indicated earlier, twenty-five institutions receiving one year registration returned useable questionnaires. This represents sixty-four percent of the total number of one year registrations (39).

The table presented here indicates mean degree of difficulty as perceived by one year registrants for each element of program development.

TABLE 3

Mean Degree of Difficulty - One Year Registrants

A. Planning of Program

1. Agreement on nature of CBTE	2.9
2. Agreement on rationale for program	2.5
3. Agreement on program objectives	1.8
4. Inclusion of professional organizations and staff	2.1
5. Cooperation of professional organizations and staff	2.6
6. Inclusion of school district (i.e. superinten. princ., etc.)	2.4
7. Cooperation of school district personnel	2.3
8. Problems of a political nature (i.e. union disputes, etc.)	2.6
9. Economic aspects of program development	3.5
10. Utilization and availability of time devoted to program development	3.6
11. Utilization and availability of space.	1.8
12. Problems in management of resources and personnel	2.5
13. Problems encountered which fall into area of Human Relations	2.2

B. Implementation of Proposed Program

1. Cooperation of institutions and agencies	2.8
2. Coordination of activities of institutions and agencies	2.2
3. Description and designation of roles of institutions and agencies	2.4
4. Description designation and meeting of responsibilities of institutions and agencies	2.8

C. Requirements to be met by Candidate to be Recommended for Certification

1. Description and definition of skills necessary for competence	2.4
2. Description and definition of knowledge necessary	2.2
3. Description and definition of attitudes necessary	3.0
4. Assessment of skills necessary	3.1
5. Assessment of knowledge necessary	2.7
6. Assessment of attitudes necessary	3.9

D. Program Design

1. Determination of specific goals of the preparatory programs	2.1
2. Rationale for decisions on the use of these specific goals	2.2
3. Determination of what means will be used to prove attainment of these goals	3.4
4. Determination of adequacy of goals and modification and revision of goals	3.2
5. Development of mechanisms for evaluation of program goals	3.5
6. Development of mechanisms to determine program effectiveness	3.6

N = 25

Scale: 1 = least difficulty
5 = most difficulty

ANALYSIS

This table reflects trends similar to those identified in Table 2. Although there is slightly less difficulty reflected in most areas the one year registrants seem to be consistent with the entire group's perceptions of degree of difficulty in element of program development. This trend will be developed and analyzed more extensively in the comparative section of Research Question II.A.

Once again the area of assessment is indicated as being most difficult. Evaluation and problems of a political and economic nature are also cited as causing difficulty in program development.

I. According to the degree of difficulty:

C. How do respondents whose programs received four year registration perceive elements of program development?

As indicated earlier, fifteen respondents returned useable questionnaires from the four year registration group. The total number of four year registrants was seventeen. Fifteen represents eighty-eight percent of the total group.

Table 4 indicates mean degree of difficulty for each element of program development.

TABLE 4

Mean Degree of Difficulty - Four Year Registrants

A. Planning of Program	
1. Agreement on nature of CBTE	3.0
2. Agreement on rationale for program	2.7
3. Agreement on program objectives	2.5
4. Inclusion of professional organizations and staff	3.0
5. Cooperation of professional organizations and staff	2.8
6. Inclusion of school district (i.e. superinten. princ., etc.)	1.9
7. Cooperation of school district personnel	2.2
8. Problems of a political nature (i.e. union disputes, etc)	2.9
9. Economic aspects of program development	3.6
10. Utilization and availability of time devoted to program development	3.5
11. Utilization and availability of space.	2.5
12. Problems in management of resources and personnel	3.2
13. Problems encountered which fall into area of Human Relations	2.6
B. Implementation of Proposed Program	
1. Cooperation of institutions and agencies	2.5
2. Coordination of activities of institutions and agencies	2.5
3. Description and designation of roles of institutions and agencies	2.5
4. Description designation and meeting of responsibilities of institutions and agencies	2.5
C. Requirements to be met by Candidate to be Recommended for Certification	
1. Description and definition of skills necessary for competence	3.5
2. Description and definition of knowledge necessary	3.2
3. Description and definition of attitudes necessary	3.5
4. Assessment of skills necessary	4.2
5. Assessment of knowledge necessary	3.8
6. Assessment of attitudes necessary	4.1
D. Program Design	
1. Determination of specific goals of the preparatory programs	2.9
2. Rationale for decisions on the use of these specific goals	2.8
3. Determination of what means will be used to prove attainment of these goals.	3.6
4. Determination of adequacy of goals and modification and revision of goals	3.5
5. Development of mechanisms for evaluation of program goals	3.7
6. Development of mechanisms to determine program effectiveness	4.2

N = 15

Scale: 1 = least difficulty
5 = most difficulty

ANALYSIS

The degree of difficulty indicated for each element of program development by four year registrants indicates the same trend towards certain problem areas. There is a tendency, however, for this group to perceive slightly more difficulty in many of the elements of program development. This trend will be analyzed more fully in the comparative section of the study. (Research Question II.A.)

Section 3. Research Question II.

A. According to degree of difficulty:

What is the relationship between the respondents' perceptions of elements of program development whose programs received one year registration, and, the respondents' perceptions of elements of program development whose programs received four year registration?

The following table presents the means of degree of difficulty for both groups. The relationship and extent of relationship has been computed for several items and is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Degree of Difficulty - One Year and Four Year Registrants

	One Year	Four Year
A. Planning of Program		
1. Agreement on nature of CNTE	2.9	3.0
2. Agreement on rationale for program	2.5	2.7
3. Agreement on program objectives	1.8	2.5
4. Inclusion of professional organizations and staff	2.1	3.0
5. Cooperation of professional organizations and staff	2.6	2.8
6. Inclusion of school district (i.e. superintendent, principal, etc.)	2.4	1.9
7. Cooperation of school district personnel	2.3	2.2
8. Problems of a political nature (i.e. union disputes, etc.)	2.6	2.9
9. Economic aspects of program development	3.5	3.6
10. Utilization and availability of time devoted to program development	3.6	3.5
11. Utilization and availability of space	1.8	2.5
12. Problems in management of resources and personnel	2.5	3.2
13. Problems encountered which fall into area of Human Relations	2.2	2.6
B. Implementation of Proposed Program		
1. Cooperation of institutions and agencies	2.8	2.5
2. Coordination of activities of institutions and agencies	2.2	2.5
3. Description and designation of roles of institutions and agencies	2.4	2.5
4. Description designation and meeting of responsibilities of institutions and agencies	2.8	2.5
C. Requirements to be met by Candidates to be Recommended for Certification		
1. Description and definition of skills necessary for competence	2.4	3.5
2. Description and definition of knowledge necessary	2.2	3.2
3. Description and definition of attitudes necessary	3.0	3.5
4. Assessment of skills necessary	3.1	4.2
5. Assessment of knowledge necessary	2.7	3.8
6. Assessment of attitudes necessary	3.9	4.1
D. Program Design		
1. Determination of specific goals of the preparatory programs	2.3	2.9
2. Rationale for decisions on the use of these specific goals	2.2	2.8
3. Determination of what means will be used to prove attainment of these goals	3.4	3.6
4. Determination of adequacy of goals and modification and revision of goals	3.2	3.5
5. Development of mechanisms for evaluation of program goals	3.5	3.7
6. Development of mechanisms to determine program effectiveness	3.6	4.2
	N = 25	N = 15

NOTE: Due to the differences in sample size between the two groups, the mean scores may be misleading. If the four year group sample size were the same as that of the one year group, a larger difference would possibly be in evidence. This is due to the fact that the mean is unduly influenced by extremes. Thus, the smaller sample size would manifest this characteristic of the mean more markedly.

ANALYSIS

As can be seen, this table shows a definite trend towards the four year group perceiving more difficulty in development of program than the one year group. Although the extent of relationship cannot be considered significant, it does present an interesting phenomena. One could assert that the State Education Department's decisions regarding the issue of program registration are given predicability by this trend. For example, if institution A perceives more difficulty than institution B then one could assume that institution A would devote more energy to the resolution of the problem area and therefore submit a more satisfactory program. In this case the decisions made by the State Education Department regarding one and four year registration are substantiated by the data. In the process of collecting data for the comprehensive study, some participants stated that if institutions perceived less difficulty and received one year registration, the State Education Department was in error in granting only one year registration.

The data can be interpreted either way depending upon one's frame of reference. However, if one assumes that four year registration recipients were more aware of the difficult problems of program development, this data certainly tends to lend credibility to the State Education Department's decisions regarding program registration.

The comparative data can be presented in summary form in terms of percentages as well as means of degree of difficulty. The following list shows eight elements of program development frequently identified by the respondents. The percentage refers to the number of respondents checking either number four or five on the rating scale. (Four or five indicate highest degree of difficulty.)

TABLE 6

Percentage of Respondents Selecting a Rating of Either 4 or 5 (Highest Degree of Difficulty)

	Program Registration	
	One Year	Four Year
1. Assessment of skills	53%	85%
2. Assessment of knowledge	34%	62%
3. Assessment of attitudes	71%	86%
4. Program Evaluation	73%	78%
5. Economic Aspects	69%	47%
6. Political Problems	46%	39%
7. Utilization and availability of time	62%	71%
8. Modification of program goals	69%	54%
	N = 25	N = 15

Of course these percentages reflect the same trend as the means of Degree of Difficulty. One year registration recipients found considerably less difficulty than four year registrants.

This is an interesting phenomena and perhaps reflects some problems with either response reliability or the State Education Department's evaluation of program proposals. In general, both groups indicate difficulty with the same general program development and design areas. On the whole, one year registrants do report less difficulty than four year registrants throughout the questionnaire although the difference in respondent groups is not statistically significant.

IMPLICATIONS

The implications of these findings fall into three categories; 1) Implications for institutions seeking to develop programs, 2) Implications for technical assistance groups, 3) Implications to researchers in the field of teacher education.

1) The implication for those institutions wishing to develop programs are clear. In order to develop a program which is satisfactory and would meet requirements generally attributed to CBTE programs, institutions should be aware of the difficulties commonly encountered in assessment and evaluation. These are the most consistently identified program areas. A program development staff should be aware of these problem areas and recognize them as such. Also, problems of an economic and political nature should be dealt with as they are frequently identified as potentially troublesome by the literature and, to some extent, by the respondents in this study. It is extremely interesting

to note that the State Education Department has indicated on several occasions that the Teachers Unions have caused considable alteration in approaches to CBTE. For example, despite the requirement of union sign off in the original format, many institutions submitted proposals without union sign off. Also, the State Education Department dropped its requirement of sign off fourteen days before the program submission deadline. Despite these indications of apparent difficulties with "professional agencies" of a "political nature," few institutions cited these areas as being problematic. Enough institutions did express concern over these areas, however, to state that institutions choosing collaborative approaches to education should be aware of the possibilities of difficulties with these elements of program development.

2) There are several implications for technical assistance groups. First, individuals providing technical assistance in the field of CBTE should seek to develop approaches to assessment and evaluation of program. Assessment seems to be a topic of considerable concern in education generally and teacher education specifically. Alternative approaches which satisfactorily meet the needs of institutions should be prepared and presented by technical assistance groups. The same is true of evaluation strategies and approaches. A large number of institutions identified this program development area as being problematic.

Additional data was gathered concerning possible strategies for delivery of services which were preferable. This data was gathered to help the Teacher Education Developmental Service plan for the year's activities. However, this data is also worthwhile to identify strategies for technical assistance groups in general and consultants working in the field of teacher education. The service which institutions found to be most beneficial was that of on-site visitations. Most institutions also reported a need for workshops on implementation and program evaluation. Pertaining to a state-wide conference, fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they would be interested in a state-wide conference regarding either assessment of student performance or evaluation of program effectiveness. Consultants were also identified as one of the services found to be most helpful to institutions in various stages of program development. Following is a summary of the results concerning most preferred type of services.

TABLE 7

Percentage of respondents preferring certain types of Technical Assistance

On Site Visits	73%
Consultants	68%
Workshops	62%

N = 40

3) A third and final implication of the study involves the area of research. Perhaps the most clear implication and result of the entire study is that of the need for more work in the area of assessment and evaluation. The majority of institutions in both groups (over 50% in all related areas) indicated that assessment and program evaluation were highly difficult elements of program development. It is conceivable that this could be a result of a lack of available assessment and evaluation information at the institutions surveyed. However, it is more likely that the available information in the field which was utilized could not meet the demands of measuring competencies. To assume that fifty-six institutions of varying scope and size had so much difficulty with assessment and evaluation was due to the fact that they did not seek out available instrumentation and research seems to be quite untenable. It is more likely that the "state of the art" in assessment and evaluation was not perceived to be able to adequately measure and evaluate what needed to be assessed. Thus, the implication seems clear that much work needs to be done in these areas in order to meet the needs which educators have for measurement and evaluation.

SUMMARY

This concludes Phase I of the research report. Although this report is a self-contained report the remaining two phases link up with it to form a more comprehensive analysis

of the problem area. This research (Phase I) was intended to function as a means of documenting perceptions of elements of program development, identifying difficult areas of program development, and comparing perceptions of program development across the two categories established by the State Education Department (one and four year registrations).

The succeeding section of this report (Phase II) will attempt to document the process of program registration utilized by the State Education Department and identify problem areas in program development based on the proposals submitted by the fifty-six institutions under study. The "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals" will again provide the framework for identifying problematic elements of program development. The utilization of the format is intended to provide continuity in the collection and analysis of the data.

PHASE II

STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS AND PERCEPTIONS

OF ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND

Phase I of this research project surveyed fifty-six institutions of higher education in order to assess what areas of program proposal design were more difficult than others. A questionnaire developed on the basis of the State Education Department format for program proposal submission, was sent to all fifty-six institutions. Seventy-one percent of the institutions responded to the questionnaire. Preliminary tabulation of the data has indicated that institutions receiving one-year registration of their program proposals from the State Education Department perceived less difficulty in program proposal formulation than institutions which received four-year registration. (The State Education Department reviewed program proposals and registered them on the basis of one-year registration or four-year. One-year registration indicated acceptance with revision and review in one year. Four-year registration indicated acceptance.)

The interaction between the State Education Department Division of Teacher Certification and the institutions of higher education played a critical role in the design of the CBTE program proposals. The Division of Teacher Certification was the agent of the State Education Department which reviewed and registered the program proposals. Also, through the entire process of program design the Division interacted with the institutions by providing guidelines, formats, and

initial recommendation for program reorganization. Because this interaction and program review played such a significant role in the process of developing CBTE formats throughout New York State it is an interesting and worthwhile phenomenon to investigate.

Phase II of the study focused on the analysis of the program proposal review procedures of the State Education Department Division of Teacher Certification.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this phase of the CBTE program proposal design needs analysis was to:

1. describe the criteria and process utilized for registration of CBTE program proposals and,
2. identify the areas of program design which the Division of Teacher Certification program analysts perceived as needing further revisions.

In order to accomplish this purpose, permission was received from ten (10) institutions which submitted programs in February 1975 to examine the Division of Teacher Certification evaluations of their program proposals.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the characteristics of the process of program review in the State Education Department Division of Teacher Education and Certification?

   Characteristics will be described as follows:

   A. Acts - what were the acts undertaken by participants in the process of program review?

B. Activities - what were the activties engaged in by participants in the process of program review?
C. Meanings - what are the verbal or written productions of participants that define or direct action.
D. Participation - what was the involvement in, or adaptation to, the process of program review on the part of Division staff?
E. Relationships - what were the interrelationships engaged in by Division staff relative to program review?
F. Setting - what was the setting in which the process of program review took place?

2. Did institutions receiving one year registration encounter difficulty in program proposal design as perceived by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification staff and, if so, in what program areas?

3. Did institutions receiving four year registration encounter difficulties in program proposal design as perceived by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification staff, and if so, in what program areas?

4. Did institutions receiving four year registration encounter more, or less, difficulty in program proposal design from institutions receiving four year registration?

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample of program proposals and Division of Teacher Certification evaluations to be utilized was determined by those institutions willing to participate. However, these institutions were categorized as follows:

1. Five institutions receiving one year registration.
2. Five institutions receiving four year registration.

Procedure

Collection of data included the following steps:

1. The process utilized by the Division of Teacher Certification was described. This description began with the development of the format for program proposal submission and continued to the point when recommendations regarding program proposals were decided upon.

2. After the process utilized by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was described the evaluations and recommendations for each institution in the sample was analyzed. This analysis was conducted by using the format for submission proposed by the State Education Department. The categories of the format for submission were:

A. Planning of program

B. Implementation of program proposal

C. Entrance requirements for candidates into employment

D. Program design

A checklist for each of these categories of program proposal development was devised (See Appendix C) in order to determine specific areas in which institutions may have encountered difficulty. This checklist was based upon the questionnaire utilized in Phase I of the study.

Analysis

The analysis of the data is based upon the configuration of the sample. The description of the process of program review is the same for all institutions in the sample.

The data collected is descriptive in nature and is also of necessity based on a small sample. Due to these facts, analysis is confined to descriptions of evaluations and recommendations and are, therefore, not quantified. All comparisons are made according to the a priori categories and checklists established and consist of written reporting of the data.

Rationale

The combination of describing the process utilized by the State Education Department Division of Teacher Education and Certification for program proposal review, and the analysis of the Division's recommendations and evaluations provide an in depth picture of the process of program registration. The difficulties institutions encountered during program proposal design have already been assessed in Phase I and this analysis (Phase II) yields data relative to the Division of Teacher Education and Certification's evaluation teams' perceptions of problem areas in program design.

It should be noted that comparisons of the data collected across types of program category and institutions is made on

the basis of the a priori framework of categories and the checklists utilized for tabulation of specific areas of difficulty.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The findings will be reported by stating the research questions and then presenting the data gathered pertinent to that research question. Analysis will proceed for each research question. A discussion section entitled "Implications" will follow the presentation and analysis of findings.

RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 1

1. What are the characteristics of the process of program review in the State Education Department Division of Teacher Education and Certification?

Characteristics

A. Acts. There were several significant acts which were performed that relate directly to program review. They are:

   1. The adoption of a competence based approach to Teacher Education by the New York State Board of Regents (reported in 1972, "Education Beyond High School - The Regents Tentative Statewide Plan for Post-Secondary Education").

   2. The presentation of a proposed approach to CBTE by SED representatives at various meetings throughout New York State (Regional Meeting - 1973).

   3. The mailing of the "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals" (1974)

4. The change in format through the deletion of the requirement of Teachers Union sign off (January 1975).

5. The receipt of proposals by SED Division of Teacher Education and Certification (February 1975).

6. The decision to grant one or four year registration to institutions' program proposals.

7. The communication of that decision to institutions.

Note: These appear to be the significant Acts in the process. They highlight major decision points related to program review. It is not necessary, in describing the total process, to state every act.

B. Activities. These are activities centered around the Acts stated above. They begin to more fully document the process. It is not the purpose of this study to document the entire development of the CBTE movement prior to program submission in February. However some of the Acts and Activities prior to submission are relevant to the program review process.

They are:

1. The establishment of trial projects (12) throughout New York State in 1971 began the formal move towards CBTE. Despite a lack of data regarding the progress of the trial projects, the SED drafted a chapter on Teacher Education into the Regents' Plan which was based on the CBTE concept. This event, although significant, is difficult to explain and document as the researcher was unable to determine the exact dynamics of the relationship between the SED and the Board of Regents. Thus, it was also difficult to pinpoint the origin of the formal impetus towards

CBTE. Interviews and some documents indicate that the legislature was contemplating a bill on CBTE.(There was a bill introduced.) However, much of the formal impetus seemed to emanate from the SED and the Division of Teacher Education and Certification. At any rate, it was these activities that prompted the action of the Regents to move to a competence based format.

2. The second activity was a series of regional meetings held by the SED Division in which a prepared statement was read and questions were asked regarding CBTE. These meetings were located throughout the state.

3. The third activity was the specific development of the "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals." This activity occurred during and after the regional meetings as the meetings were utilized to provide input necessary to formulation of the format. The format development activity was extensive and attempted to include input from Division of Teacher Education and Certification staff and experts in the field of CBTE. This was a critical activity as it was the primary document with which institutions had to deal in submitting program proposals.

4. The fourth major activity area was the change in format regarding collaboration. This is a complex political phenomenon. A copy of the memorandum from the SED regarding these changes is attached (Appendix D). Also attached is an analysis of the collaborative aspects of program development which reflects substantial change from what the SED expected in terms of collaboration (Appendix E). These two documents help illustrate the activities centered around collaboration.

5. The fifth activity began with receipt of proposals by SED. The activity of program review consisted of two dimensions. Specific curriculum content areas were reviewed by experts at SED in each particular field. These experts made recommendations concerning possible revisions and appropriateness of the proposals. The design and elements of the program pertaining

to CBTE characteristics were examined and reviewed by the staff of the Division of Teacher Education and Certification. The 146 proposals were distributed to various individuals who were responsible for coordinating the review process for each program. Although these individuals were responsible for program review, the actual decision regarding registration was made by a group of staff in the Division. It is extremely difficult to document the internal dynamics of the review process as documents pertaining to it are not abundant. There are "in house" documents (summary statements) pertaining to each program. The researcher was given access to these. They delineate major areas of concern and are not exceedingly specific. However, the overall process seems to be generally consistent for each program.

It should be noted that institutions who were affiliated with the State University system had an additional step. Their proposals were first sent to the Central Office of the State University of New York for initial screening and review. After revisions were made (if necessary) the SUNY Central Office submitted the programs to the SED Division.

6. The final step in the process consisted of the letter of program registration which was ordinarily drafted by SED Division staff and submitted to the Associate Commissioner for Undergraduate Education for disbursement. This letter was merely a notice of registration. Recommendations for revision where appropriate were sent by SED Division staff.

C. Meanings. This category of the documentation process requires a different mode of presentation. There are several hundred documents which could be presented here. Only a few have been chosen. They are presented here in terms of the Acts and Activities they give meaning to.

Act-Activity #1. a. Give Up The Ship by Alvin Lierheimer

b. "A New Style of Certification", March 15, 1971, SED, Division of Teacher Education and Certification

c. "Education Beyond High School - Regents Tentative Statewide Plan for Post-Secondary Education", 1972

Act-Activity #2. a. Presentation to regional meetings, 1973. Available through SED Division of Teacher Education and Certification. Dr. William Boyd, presenter.

Act-Activity #3. a. "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals" Appendix A of this research report. (1975)

Act-Activity #4. a. Memorandum on Collaboration - January 1975. Appendix D of this research report.

b. "Analysis of Issues in Collaboration," March 1975. Appendix E of this report.

Act-Activity #5. a. This is the most difficult area to document as the Division was intentionally non-specific in its statement of criteria upon which programs were to be registered. Despite considerable criticism from the field regarding this "vagueness" the Division staff maintained its position in order to "provide the flexibility" necessary for creative, innovative programs. The only real criteria to be utilized was the extent to which institutions addressed the Program Areas identified in the "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals." Most documents regarding "in house" discussion of the review process are confidential and not available for publication. They are basically "working" documents utilized for internal communications.

Act-Activity #6. a. The letters which were sent to registrants are the only documentation

available for this phase of the process. They provide little information except for the announcement of one or four year registration.

Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, it is exceedingly difficult to document the actual dynamics of program review. While several interviews were held with SED Division staff, SUNY Central Office staff, and individuals in institutions of higher education throughout the state, only the parameters of the process could be described. The details can only be established through the use of much more intensive probing and possible use of "informants". At no time, however, was there any specific information presented in an interview which would indicate that the SED Division was arbitrary in its granting of program registrations. Charges to this effect were made several times by officials at every level but no documentation or specificity could be provided to substantiate such charges. This could be viewed as evidence that the process was ethically and objectively conducted, or the Division succeeded in covering its mistakes exceedingly well. There is every indication that the first supposition is correct.

D. Participation.

1. The participants in the program review process

are too numerous to mention. This is certainly true of the early stages of CBTE development in New York State. Basically, the participants were staff of the SED Division of Teacher Education and Certification. Also included were the Associate Commissioner for Undergraduate Education, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education of the State University of New York, and the Regents. These participants were consistently involved in the process and received vast amounts of information from numerous sources. These sources included Teachers Unions, School Superintendents, University Deans, University faculties, interested citizens, legislators, and others. However, those identified as participants were the key figures in the establishment and continuation of the review process.

E. Relationships. The relationships between the participants is an interesting phenomenon. There are two major patterns. One deals with the Division and its relationship with the Regents. The other is the relationship of the Division with the institutions of higher education.

The first area, the Division's relationship with the Regents consists of two elements. The first element is identifying where leadership originates. The second element concerns the issue of control. In terms of leadership, it is the Regents responsibility to provide goals and direction to education. However, in the case of CBTE, the SED Division prompted the movement. It seems, through data collected in interviews, that the Division staff "sold the Regents" on CBTE as the way to go in the future. Data to substantiate this claim can be found in the fact that the Division drafted the chapter

outlining the CBTE format for the Regents. Thus, the Division controlled, to a considerable extent, the information flow to the Regents. These characteristics of the relationship point up an interesting discussion of control which is the second element of the relationship.

The Division staff is definitely responsible to the Regents through the hierarchy of the SED. After the decision to move towards CBTE by the Regents the staff was "pushed to get the movement underway" and "set up a time line for submission." These statements were obtained during interviews with staff in the Division who reported to the Regents. Despite this manifestation of control by the Regents it is also true, as stated earlier, that the initial push towards CBTE initiated in the Division. In such a case it is difficult to discern who is exercising leadership and control in the formulation and implementation of educational policy. The dynamics of this relationship are extremely interesting and merit further investigation. They do, however, go beyond the scope of this study despite the fact that the dynamics of the relationship should be pointed out to set the context for the review process.

The second relationship concerns the Division and the institutions. This relationship was basically one

of control. The Division utilized its authority as designated in the Commissioner's guidelines to register teacher education programs. It has attempted to change the nature of the Teacher Education process by mandating that the CBTE format, as delineated in the Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals, be utilized for development of teacher training programs. This utilization of power to make decisions regarding program registration is basically coercive in nature. Thus, the relationship between the Division and institutions (including SUNY institutions) was characterized by the use of power and coercion.

F. Setting. The setting for the conduct of the program review was confined to the SED buildings in Albany, New York. Political and social factors have been discussed in previous categories. The only additional factor relative to setting was the fact that much controversy existed over CBTE in many areas of the State. This controversy included two areas. The first was that concerning the question of whether or not CBTE was desirable. The second was over implementation of the mandate. These are only mentioned so the reader is aware that the program review process was conducted in a social and academic setting of heated controversy and debate. (A case study addressing these issues is

available through TEDS.)

This concludes the presentation and analysis of the program review process as required by Research Question Number 1.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS NUMBERS 2, 3, AND 4

The presentation of data and analysis for these research questions can be addressed in one section. A restatement of the research questions follows:

2. Did institutions receiving one year registration encounter difficulty in program proposal design as perceived by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification staff and, if so, in what program areas?

3. Did institutions receiving four year registration encounter difficulties in program proposal design as perceived by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification staff, and if so, in what program areas?

4. Did institutions receiving four year registration encounter more, or less, difficulty in program proposal design from institutions receiving four year registration?

For both questions two and three the answer is the same. The SED Division identified assessment as the most frequently problematic area in program proposals. This was true of both one and four year registrants. Assessment and evaluation were most definitely the main areas of concern expressed by the Division's program review groups. The content analysis of SED documentation of program review could not go much

further in identifying problem areas as written documentation was not extensive.

It is probably the case, however, that issues of collaboration would have been a substantial problem area but this possibility was all but eliminated by the deletion of the Union sign off demand. This area was of course quite problematic but did not show up in program review. An analysis of the collaborative issue (Appendix E) was conducted. This did not appear to substantially effect decisions regarding program registration.

Beyond the areas of assessment and evaluation, very little data could be gathered. Due to the lack of documentation the process of obtaining this information would have required time and resources not available to the researcher. The SED was extremely cooperative but the research techniques of content analysis and interview did not yield the necessary data. It is quite possible that documentation of this portion of the study may be impossible because of the lapse of time.

Research Question Number Four is also difficult to answer because documentation was not extensive enough to provide answers. It appears that the same problem areas were identified. for both one and four registrants. The issue seems to be one of degree of problem encountered. Documentation of this area was not available to the researcher and could therefore not be included in the study.

This concludes the presentation and analysis of findings for Phase Two of the study. Implications of the study follow.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are several recommendations as a result of this study:

1. The SED, in the future, should make as extensive an effort as possible, within the limits of its resources, to document and publish its process for program review. This would not only facilitate evaluation and research, but also provide important information to institutions submitting programs.

2. The SED should, wherever appropriate, give clear and precise criteria to be utilized in the granting of program registrations. This could make the process as objective as possible.

3. The SED should be provided with additional resources and staff so that the preceding two suggestions can be implemented. (It appeared to the researcher that much of this could have been accomplished had there been adequate resources available.)

4. On site visitations should be conducted as frequently as possible so that communication can be established and/or

maintained and the SED can be aware of problems resulting from their institutions. (This could have perhaps alleviated some problems in collaboration.)

5. Further research should be conducted into the political and social issues impinging on education to alleviate problems in the future resulting from mandated change.

6. The relationships between various agencies of the government and education should be analyzed to determine the dynamics of power and conflict in education.

SUMMARY

Although much of the information which was needed to complete this study could not be obtained, it has served to point out critical problem areas in education. As stated in the recommendations many specific and general problem areas needing further attention have been identified. These are significant results in and of themselves.

The final phase (Phase III) of the research project is presented in the following pages. Due to a relative scarcity of data, it is brief.

PHASE III

COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND

Research into two separate areas has been conducted. These two areas are:

1. Perceptions of elements of CBTE Program Development at the institutional level; and,
2. Perceptions of elements of CBTE Program Development at the SED level.

Phase II also included a documentation of the program review process. These two sections have utilized the "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals" (Appendix A) as a framework for the collection and analysis of data. This format was developed by the SED, Division of Teacher Education and Certification to provide guidelines for program proposal development for all institutions submitting programs on or before February 1, 1975. The format has provided an excellent framework for the conduct of the first phase of the study. However, the utilization of the format, as planned, proved ineffective in the second phase of the study.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this phase is: to compare data yielded by Phase I and Phase II concerning perceptions of elements of program development held by institutions and the SED.

RATIONALE

The "Format for Submission of Teacher Education Program Proposals" identifies program areas related to CBTE. These program areas are perceived in differing ways depending upon the stages of development and resources institutions have at their

disposal. Similarly the SED holds perceptions of these program areas and forms decisions based upon their perceptions of how well institutions resolve problems related to them in their program proposals. A comparison of these sets of perceptions can yield data relative to:

1. Areas of agreement concerning elements of program development; and
2. Areas of disagreement concerning elements of program development.

This data can point out where institutions need technical assistance as viewed by themselves and the SED. In this way a rough index of the extent to which the institutions and the SED agree or disagree on CBTE program development can be compiled.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Are the perceptions of elements of program design of the institutions and the SED similar or dissimilar?

This restatement of the purpose and research question for this phase of the study has been necessary because the nature of the data obtained has not been entirely consistent with what was anticipated. However, some significant findings can be reported concerning the perceptions of the two groups. The findings appear in the next section of this report.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Upon completion of both phases of data collection, the

most significant finding is that assessment and evaluation are the primary sources of difficulty in development of CBTE programs. Assessment and evaluation were identified consistently by both groups as problem areas.

In the documentation provided to the researcher by the SED assessment was cited most frequently as that area needing refinement and revision in all proposals, regardless of period of registration granted. Program evaluation was often included as a problem area. Both of these areas focus on the issue of measurement. Despite major attempts at the resolution of difficulties in assessment and evaluation by Technical Assistance Groups and the State Education Department this problem area persisted as the most problematic element of program development.

This contention is supported by the fact that the SED held a statewide conference on Assessment in May of 1976 in response to demands from the field and its own analysis of program proposals.

It is also supported by data gathered through interviews with SED Division staff, SUNY Central Office staff and various faculty and administrators in the institutions required to develop CBTE programs.

Another source of documentation for the contention that assessment and evaluation were critical problem areas in

CBTE program development is that it is mentioned in several documents related to the CBTE movement in New York State. For example, the University Deans Council points to assessment as an area needing further research before CBTE can be adequately implemented.

Another problem area with which institutions and the SED had to grapple was that of collaboration. Collaborative efforts were considered moderately difficult by the institutions involved. Yet the SED found it necessary to alter the guidelines for submission significantly as Teachers Union groups prompted their affiliates to not sign off CBTE program proposals. This apparent discrepancy between the amount of time invested by the SED to resolve collaborative difficulties and the institutions' relatively low ranking of it as a problem area can be partially explained.

One explanation might be that collaboration was not difficult in terms of putting programs together, but did become a problem when sign off emerged as an issue. Thus, the decision by SED to remove the sign off requirement relieved many institutions of the formal documentation of collaboration. Collaboration in the process sense of the term may have occurred. However, in the formal documentation of collaboration it would appear that it did not occur. The SED requirement of sign off would relate to the formal documentation. Thus they would perceive it as an extremely difficult problem. The institution's major concern would be that of process. Thus, they would not perceive it as a problem as collaboration could occur at the local level whether or not formal sign off occurred.

There is data available from the comprehensive statewide study ("Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs", Teacher Education Developmental Service, 1976) which supports this point of view. There is substantial documentation available through the comprehensive study which supports the claim that collaboration amongst teachers, institutions of higher education, and school district administrators did occur despite the fact that many agencies did not sign off on proposals.

These two primary areas, measurement and collaboration, appear repeatedly in the perceptions of institutions and the activities of the SED. There is considerable evidence to support the statement that the SED and the institutions of higher education agreed to a large extent on what areas of program development caused major difficulties. Despite a lack of documentation regarding the actual process of program review, the activities of the SED, Division of Teacher Education and Certification support the contention that these areas caused difficulty in program development and program review.

Findings regarding the other elements of program development cannot be presented as the SED did not indicate them as being problematic in the documents made available to the researcher. Reference to other elements of program development was not made in interviews with SED staff. Thus, data on the elements addressed by institutions in the questionnaire cannot be dealt with here as there is no data available from the SED.

IMPLICATIONS

There are two major implications of this comparative phase of the study.

1. Assessment and evaluation are perceived as difficult elements of CBTE program development. Further research and assistance must be made available to institutions if CBTE program development is to continue throughout New York State. With both groups perceiving assessment and evaluation as very difficult it would seem logical to assume that progress must be made in these areas before CBTE can reach its full potential as a teaching modality.

It is significant to note that problems in assessment and evaluation are not particular to the SED mandate. Despite significant advancement in educational measurement, it has continued to be a major problem area in education for some time. Thus, the indication that assessment and evaluation were particularly problematic in CBTE program development is not surprising. What is somewhat confusing is that the SED pursued a CBTE policy with an awareness that assessment and evaluation are difficult problems.

It could be argued that just because there are problems in assessment and evaluation, attempts to improve the quality of education should not be set aside. However, accurate assessment and evaluation are critical elements of CBTE. Without the ability to measure program effectiveness and the degree to which skills have been learned, CBTE becomes

a considerably less effective teaching modality. The stipulation of entrance and exit requirements, specifically identified, is an insignificant activity if the existence of the necessary requirements cannot be ascertained. It may very well be the case that CBTE provides a more adequate conceptual framework for identifying the necessary characteristics of "successful" teachers and, CBTE may therefore lead to the development of more precise means of measuring those characteristics. Even if this is so (and there are those who argue that it is not), it is not an adequate justification for the mandating of CBTE as the approach to be used for training teachers throughout New York State.

On this basis it is implied that: <u>The data base used by the SED in recommending the Regents Mandate for CBTE as the dominant modality for training teachers was insufficient</u>.

Related to this implication is the fact that the SEA did not specify the criteria upon which it would base its decisions regarding program registration. The Division of Teacher Education and Certification purposely avoided being "too specific" in its identification of criteria as they wanted to provide the greatest amount of flexibility possible within the CBTE format. This, of course, is a sound rationale for the lack of specificity to be found in the SED documents regarding program registration. However, CBTE attempts to be specific, to delineate competencies, and accurately assess the development of those competencies. If these are important components of CBTE, why were they not also important components in the registration process?

Furthermore, the lack of specificity and documentation of procedures to be utilized for granting program registration made it difficult for institutions to focus on what types of programs to develop. It also fostered an atmosphere of "insecurity" among many participants since what would be acceptable or not acceptable was not specified. Finally, some individuals interviewed stated that this lack of specificity was a clear indication that not even the SED really "knew what CBTE was."

The implication from this data is that: the SED did not supply sufficient information regarding criteria upon which they would base decisions regarding program registration. This lack of information has made it difficult to document the program review process and has made it impossible to ascertain whether or not institutional change in teacher education has taken place.

Due to this set of circumstances it is impossible to determine whether or not one or four year registration reflects quality of program at any of the institutions involved. It is also impossible to ascertain whether or not program proposals receiving differing registrations are, in fact, significantly different from each other.

2. Problems dealing with collaboration have significantly altered the direction and focus of the CBTE movement. Research into the issues of power and conflict in the development of CBTE programs could illuminate the problem area to a considerable extent. Another implication is that the SED should attempt to more accurately assess the ramifications of its requirements for collaboration prior to the development of educational programs and new guidelines for CBTE.

There are two specific implications related to the collaborative approach mandated. As indicated earlier the mandate required collaboration among three distinct and very different groups. It is this aspect of CBTE which proved to be the most difficult program element to implement. In many cases proposals were sent in without sign off by one or both of the groups who were to participate (Teacher program-ization, school district administrators).

Collaboration is one of the most significant elements of CBTE. The impression that it did not occur is erroneous as many groups collaborated in developing programs. However, much of this collaboration was voluntary and was in evidence prior to the existence of the mandate. It was not until after the mandate that collaboration became a significant issue and teachers unions became deeply involved in encouraging union chapters not to sign off on program proposals. Thus, the mandate, in many instances, impeded the collaborative process and collaboration became a formal issue of unions and school district administrators.

The implication related to the mandate and collaboration is that: the mandate seemed to impede the collaborative process and promote opposition to CBTE in New York State.

The second implication resulting from the collaborative effort also results from impact of the mandate. Collaboration became a difficult aspect in program proposal development because the SEA required participation of three very different groups. Two of these groups (teachers unions and school district administrators) often assumed adversary relationships during the contract negotiation process. The third group (the institution of higher education) was responsible for the submission of the proposal. Two distinct problems arose here. One is a result of the dynamics of the relationship already in evidence between teachers and administrators. The other problem relates to the fact that the IHE is in a powerless position and it is, therefore, possible for the other groups to control the process. To have responsibility for a process without means of controlling it is an uncomfortable position to be in. Thus, it would appear that the collaborative aspect of the mandate seemed unworkable when viewed in terms of power and of the already existent relationships between the groups expected to collaborate.

The implication here is that: the mandate placed unrealistic demands upon the institution of higher education with regard to the administration and development of a collaborative effort amongst the groups involved.

These implications are presented to further illuminate the data and provide a basis for the application of the results of the study.

SUMMARY

This study has examined an extremely complex phenomena. The interrelationship of the SED and institutions of higher education is a difficult study to undertake.

The comments presented at the closing of each phase of the study clearly reveal that the researcher has merely "scratched the surface" in attempting to analyze CBTE program development in New York State.

However, this is but one of many approaches to the problems. Many other studies using differing methodologies and theoretical perpectives have been conducted. As stated in the implications, much research remains to be done.

It is hoped that this initial probe into the problem area will stimulate further research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Chamblis, William J., Editor. Sociological Readings in the Conflict Perspective. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1973.

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine and Atherton, 1967.

Lofland, John. Analyzing Social Settings. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1971.

Rosner, Benjamin. The Power of Competency Based Teacher Education: A Report. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Articles and Essays

Cody, Wilmer S. "Governance, Accountability and Evaluation in Education Discussed in the Content of a Tension Model." Paper presented to Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1974.

Eliot, Thomas. "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics," American Political Science Review, 1959.

Lutz, Frank W. "Why Teacher Militancy," IRS Journal, Vol. I, 1969.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. "The Forces of Social Change" appearing in Sociological Readings in the Conflict Perspective, William Chamblis, Editor. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1973.

Sederburg, William A. "Conflict Over Educational Accountability," Kappa Delta Pi, Vol. II, No. 3, February 1975.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Due to the wide variety of approaches taken throughout the state in developing the CBTE format, it is necessary to standardize the following terms to insure consistencey in collection and interpretation of responses.

1. Consortium- The collective entity comprised of the agencies and institutions involved in developing the CBTE program. The consortia might include; Teachers' Unions, Community Organizations, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), School Districts, etc.

2. Policy Board- Group which coordinates and/or directs the activitites of the consortia membership as the CBTE format is developed. The Policy Board consists of representatives of the groups who participate in the Consortium.

3. Task Force- Group responsible specifically for the development of the program proposal. Task Force usually consists of members of the various organizations in the consortia who have an interest or expertise in a specific educational area. For instance, a Task Force on elementary education might consist of two faculty members from a university, three elementary school teachers, and two parents.

4. IHE- This refers to the Institution of Higher Education involved in the consortium.

5. Mandate- The provisions of Education Law #6842 and the criteria establised by the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification which outlined the competency-based requirements for program registration with the State Education Department.

6. School District- School District involved in the consortium.

7. Professional Agency- This usually refers t the Teachers' Union involved in the consortium.

8. Program Proposal- Document submitted, by the IHE and consortia, to the State Education Department for registration.

9. Program Registration- Refers to the State Education Department's decision to register a program for one year or four years.

NOTE: All programs and program proposals, forming the focal point of this study, were to be submitted to the State Education Department on or before February 1, 1975. These include:

N-6	Deaf
Speech-Hearing	Blind
Special Education	7-9

APPENDIX B

TEACHER EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES

INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Instructions for Questionnaire Completion

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about difficulties encountered by institutions in the designing of the C.B.T.E. format. This information will lead to a clearer picture of the problems involved in the development of C.B.T.E. programs, which could lead to adjustments and refinements in the process. Also, the questionnaire is an attempt at gathering information relative to the needs of institutions in the coming year. This information will help TEDS prepare a more relevant and concise delivery of services.

As a result of these two areas of interest the questionnaire has two sections. The first is designed to determine where you are at present and where you have been. The second section is designed to determine what you see ahead and ways we might be of assistance to you in the future.

It should be noted that there is a questionnaire attached for each one of your program areas. (i.e. N-6, Special Ed., etc.) If the problems encountered differed significantly from program to program please fill out a questionnaire for each. If similar problems were encountered in all programs one questionnaire will be sufficient.

If you have any questions regarding TEDS or the questionnaire please feel free to contact us.

Questions concerning:

Workshops, consultancies, on-site visitations, contact

Dan Ganeles - (518) 457-3374

Library services and holdings, contact

Marge Benedict - (518) 457-3374

Questionnaire, contact

David Rostetter - (518) 472-8482
Mon., Wed., Thurs., Fri.
1:00 to 4:00

TEDS
SUNY-A
1400 Washington Ave.
Albany, N.Y.

October 1975

SECTION I

INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT
QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of person filling out questionnaire_____

Name of institution_____

Number of students enrolled in Teacher Education Programs_____

Number of faculty directly engaged in teaching Teacher Education Program_____

Program Description:

- ☐ N-6
- ☐ 7-9
- ☐ Blind
- ☐ Special Ed.
- ☐ Speech Hearing
- ☐ Deaf

1. Please indicate the stage of development of your CBTE program.

   - ☐ Formation of planning groups and development of rationale and overall program outcomes.
   - ☐ Initial program planning and design.
   - ☐ Review and revision of initial program.
   - ☐ Program implementation.

2. Has your CBTE program been registered with the State Education Department?

   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

3. If Yes has it been for

   - ☐ 1 year
   - ☐ 4 years

3. Following is a scale to determine the nature and extent of difficulties encountered. There are four basic categories of program development. The questions are designed to specify the problem areas within these specific program categories.

	Degree of Difficulty				
	Least Amount				Greatest Amoun
A. Planning of Program	1	2	3	4	5
1. Agreement on nature of CBTE					
2. Agreement on rationale for program					
3. Agreement on program objectives					
4. Inclusion of professional organizations and staff					
5. Cooperation of professional organizations and staff					
6. Inclusion of school district (i.e. superinten. princ., etc.)					
7. Cooperation of school district personnel					
8. Problems of a political nature (i.e. union disputes, etc.)					
9. Economic aspects of program development					
10. Utilization and availability of time devoted to program development					
11. Utilization and availability of space.					
12. Problems in management of resources and personnel					
13. Problems encountered which fall into area of Human Relations					
B. Implementation of Proposed Program					
1. Cooperation of institutions and agencies					

	Degree of Difficulty				
	Least Amount				Greatest Amount
	1	2	3	4	5
2. Coordination of activities of institutions and agencies					
3. Description and designation of roles of institutions and agencies					
4. Description designation and meeting of responsibilities of institutions and agencies					
C. Requirements to be met by Candidate to be Recommended for Certification					
1. Description and definition of skills necessary for competence					
2. Description and definition of knowledge necessary					
3. Description and definition of attitudes necessary					
4. Assessment of skills necessary					
5. Assessment of knowledge necessary					
6. Assessment of attitudes necessary					
D. Program Design					
1. Determination of specific goals of the preparatory programs					
2. Rationale for decisions on the use of these specific goals					
3. Determination of what means will be used to prove attainment of these goals.					
4. Determination of adequacy of goals and modification and revision of goals					
5. Development of mechanisms for evaluation of program goals					
6. Development of mechanisms to determine program effectiveness					

(Questionnaire continued)

4. Please indicate any areas--CBTE development--which have proven to be particularly difficult and, if possible, indicate reasons for the problems.

5. Please indicate mechanisms and approaches which you have found particularly useful in meeting problems encountered (i.e. inservice training, consultants, workshops, etc.)

SECTION II

INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you anticipate problems similar to those indicated in Section I of the questionnaire?

☐ Yes

☐ No

a) If no, in what ways will these anticipated difficulties differ?

2. What role do you see an organization such as TEDS playing in helping you cope with these problems?

3. At present TEDS offers four types of workshops. Which one(s) would you feel could be of service to you.

☐ Instructional Supervision - a three day intensive training session for supervisors

☐ Program Development - a two or three day training session for task groups responsible for CBTE program development

☐ Program Implementation - a two or three day training session for groups involved in the implementation of the CBTE format

☐ Program Management - a training program in the collaborative solving of problems which arise in CBTE programs

4. Are there other types of workshops or services which you forsee as being helpful to you?

5. TEDS is in the process of planning a state wide conference on CBTE. What topics would you want this conference to address?

6. Other ideas which would be of help to you in attending such a conference.

APPENDIX C

Checklist for Tabulation of Degrees of Difficulty Encountered

Name of Institution

Registration ( ) 1 year; ( ) 4 year

	Comments made	
	yes	no
A. Program Planning		
1. Nature of CBTE program		
2. Rationale for program		
3. Program objectives		
4. Inclusion of professional organizations and staff		
5. Inclusion of school district (i.e. superintendent, principal, etc.)		
6. Problems of political nature (union inclusion etc.)		
7. Economic aspects of program development		
8. Utilization of time devoted to program development		
B. Implementation of Proposal Program		
1. Cooperation of institution and agencies		
2. Coordination of activities of institutions and agencies		
3. Description and designation of roles and responsibilities of institutions and agencies		

	Comments made	
	yes	no
C. Requirements to be met by canidate to be recommended for certification.		
1. Description and definition of skills necessary for competence		
2. Description and definition of knowledge necessary		
3. Description and definition of attitudes necessary		
4. Assessment of skills		
5. Assessment of knowledge		
6. Assessment of attitudes		
D. Program Design		
1. Determination of specific goals of preparatory programs.		
2. Rationale for specific goals.		
3. Means utilized to attain these goals.		
4. Adequacy, modification, and revision of goals.		
5. Mechanism for evaluation of program goals.		
6. Mechanisms to determine and improve program effectiveness.		

Other comments regarding any aspect of program evaluation.

Additional comments relative to program evaluation comments on checklist.

APPENDIX D

COPY

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

COPY

January 16, 1975

MEMORANDUM TO: Chief Executive Officers of Higher Institutions
Teacher Educator Contact Members
Deans of Teacher Education
City, Village, District Superintendents
Supervising Principals
Professional Staff of School Districts
Other Interested Persons

FROM: Alvin P. Lierheimer

SUBJECT: Collaboration in Teacher Education - February 1, 1975 Due Date for Proposals in Elementary and Special Education

In response to the 1972 Regents Plan for Post-Secondary Education, teachers, school administrators, and college representatives throughout the State have engaged in planning and designing competence-based teacher education programs. These efforts have been built on the commitment to realizing a closer collaborative relationship among key parties in the preparation of teachers.

In this effort the parties have been working in uncharted areas. The task of building new collaborative relationships has at times been difficult, but substantial progress has been made in many parts of the state in designing teacher education programs in a competence mode. The contribution of teachers and school district personnel to program design has been especially notable.

However, in recent months the collaborative planning efforts in several localities have been impeded because certain parties have insisted on introducing issues of "terms and conditions of employment" as prerequisite to or part of the process of preparing teacher education programs. Such matters are properly to be considered within the scope of the negotiations between school districts and bargaining agents. They are not appropriate for consideration in the development of teacher education programs. The injection of collective bargaining issues into this process has caused disruption of the collaborative teacher education effort. The Department expects the CBTE program proposal to deal with the educational and programmatic aspects and not with negotiated terms and conditions pertinent to individual interests.

On January 10, 1975, Thomas Y. Hobart, President of the New York State United Teachers, sent the following mailgram to all NYSUT local Presidents and the NYSUT Board of Directors:

"NYSUT locals participating in CBTE projects are requested to postpone signing CBTE consortial agreements with colleges and universities until further notice. NYSUT is meeting with State Education Department officials to resolve problems resulting from the Regents mandate and timetable.

Results of the meeting will be forwarded to you shortly."

The State Education Department is extremely disturbed by this action, taken only three weeks before the first of a series of deadlines for the receipt of revised programs proposals by the Department.

Even though President Hobart's action poses problems for all parties in this effort, and particularly for colleges and universities which must submit proposals by February 1, 1975, that due date for proposals in elementary education and special education remains in effect.

We expect that every effort will be made to continue collaborative development of the teacher education programs, and that program proposals, including approval and statements as required by the Department guidelines of July 1, 1974, will be submitted. If by February 1, 1975 one or more of the parties refuse to approve a program proposal or to submit a statement of reservations, a college or university should notify the remaining cooperating parties but need not require that these other parties approve or submit a statement.

In such case the college or university is required to complete the development of the program and to submit the proposal to the Department together with a report describing the collaborative effort until the point of disruption. The following points should be addressed in the report:

1. Identification of the school districts and professional staff representatives involved in developing the proposal.

2. History of the collaborative effort:

   (a) when initiated,

   (b) scope of the effort (attendance at meetings, frequency of meetings, etc.)

   (c) status of effort prior to cessation.

3. The basis on which the college or university determined the date and reason for withdrawal by any party from the effort.

4. A statement indicating how the college or university reported action on item three above to other parties and the response of other parties.

The Board of Regents and the Department continue to believe that the involvement of school district personnel is of significant importance to the improvement of teacher education. In keeping with that conviction, we will continue to require colleges and universities to take reasonable steps to work with school district personnel in developing teacher education programs.

The Department will be pleased to meet with interested parties to discuss collaboration in teacher education at their request.

APPENDIX E

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12230

March, 1975

ANALYSIS OF ISSUES IN COLLABORATION

During the final months of 1974 evidence of growing discord among selected consortia planning teacher education programs became apparent. This discord came to a climax when, on January 10 Thomas Hobart, President of the New York State United Teachers, sent a mailgram to all local presidents requesting that local associations not sign consortial agreements until further notice.

Because of the impending due date for revised preparatory programs to be submitted to the Department (February 1, 1975) it was necessary for the Department to respond to the union president's suggestion. Thus, colleges and universities that were expected to submit programs by February 1 were informed of the steps they needed to take if appropriate signatures from teacher representatives were not forthcoming.

To determine the effect of the NYSUT action and the subsequent action of the Department a consultant was employed to review the proposals submitted by college and universities. The consultants was asked to examine the various facets of the collaborative effort as delineated in each of the proposals.

The data which follow is the result of the consultant's review and analysis.

Tables I through VII identify, in quantitative terms, data about number of proposals reviewed and the categories of persons involved in the planning and development of the program.

The data in Chart VIII is a count of those proposals that were submitted under the revised procedures as announced in the Department's memorandum (copy attached) sent in response to Mr. Hobart's mailgram of January 10.

A basic feature of the discord was the inclusion of "Terms and Conditions of Employment" in the program document. While Chart IX indicates that the percentage of proposals reviewed including terms and conditions of employment is not overwhelming. It is significant enough to warrant that the Department clarify its stance regarding the involvement of school personnel in the planning of teacher education programs.

Chart X provides an analysis of the substance of inclusions related to "Terms and Conditions of Employment".

Concern has been expressed regarding the possibility that an agency party to a consortium might relinquish certain responsibilities and rights which by regulation or law they could not delegate to a consortium or any other agency. For example, it was believed that higher education institutions might, because of pressure, relinquish their exclusive right to decide what candidates are admitted to teacher preparatory programs or what students are recommended to the State for certification.

Charts XII and XIII identify the number of proposals which deal with two specific issues related to the delegation of "rights of higher education institutions". Relatively few proposals suggest any abrogation of rights in these two areas. These two charts may, however, not tell the complete story. Six proposals in each category indicate that definition in these areas has not been completed and Chart XI may well include these delegation of rights within the veto power rights.

Table XIV suggests that the roles and responsibilities to be performed by college and school personnel do not differ in marked respect from what currently is stated as existing. Note must be made, however, that even though descriptions may not be differ the actual performance may well be quite different.

During 1973 the Advisory Board on Teacher Education, Certification and Practice approved a statement entitled "The Educational Rights of Students" while the actual statement is not appended to the guidelines, the essence of the statement is incorporated in the body of the guidelines. Table XVI reflects one important aspect of the statement related to student protection. In a move toward greater publicness and explicitness it is important for students to be provided some measure of "due process". The sample reviewed showed that 22 percent had incorporated this area and another 2 percent had the issue under discussion.

The New York State United Teachers has adopted a guideline which recommends that teachers be involved in the everyday evaluation of student teachers, but that the final responsibility be the college's. Table XVII suggests that the guideline is being followed in that the evaluation of student teachers is either a collegiate responsibility or one jointly implemented.

The Department's guidelines asked that cooperating agencies include in the submission a statement of agreement with the proposed program and/or any reservations that the agency had regarding the impact of implementing the proposed program. Table XVIII summarizes the substance of the reservations that were included. The cataloging of reservations indicates that reservations about substantive program issues were not included in the statements.

Chart XVIX indicates that we are understandably quite far from sophisticated programs that depend primarily on output measures. The course and semester hour structure, while not required to be submitted, shows up quite often. This was to be expected and at this time is not a disturbing factor. The promise of change, however, is not large. One of NYSUT's guidelines states, ". . .the well educated beginning teacher must still be prepared via classroom instruction which necessitates a knowledge base measured in required credit hours. Successful completion of proficiency examinations may be used only

to justify placement in advanced or specialized courses."

Chart XX does not lend many new insights to the selection of school staff to serve as cooperating teachers. Only three of the proposals dealt with the issue of appropriate criteria for providing this service. While not startling, the data does suggest that this is an area which needs attention by Department staff.

The total number of CBTE proposals received is 221 out of a possible 295. The reviewer has read 194 proposals which represents 65.8% of the proposals expected and 87.8% of the proposals received as 2/24/75. This information reflects evidence found in the proposals and does not include input from any outside sources with the exceptions of footnotes 2 and 3 which are self-explanatory.

I.

The number of proposals submitted by institutions of higher education.

Non-Public:	116 proposals	from 51 institutions
SUNY:	51 proposals	from 13 institutions
CUNY:	27 proposals	from 7 institutions
	194 proposals	71 institutions of higher education

II.

The number of proposals:

	Non Public	SUNY	CUNY	TOTALS
a. approved by consortial groups without reservations	42	28	2	72
b. approved with reservations	11	3	6	20
c. unsigned by one or more groups	63	20	19	102
TOTALS	116	51	27	194

III.

The number of school districts involved with CBTE proposals.

Non-Public:	197
SUNY:	136
CUNY:	39
Total	372 school districts

IV.

The number of private institutions (hospitals, day care centers, institutions for the deaf, blind, etc.) involved with CBTE proposals.

Non-Public:	34
SUNY:	13
CUNY:	4
Total	51

V. The number of staff representatives involved in the CBTE proposals.

	Non Public	SUNY	CUNY	TOTALS
a. Institutions of Higher Education	345	36	111	492
b. School District Administration	314	69	50	433
c. Teachers	290	89	58	437
d. Other[1]	142	43	33	218
TOTALS	1091	237	252	1580

[1] consultants, parents, graduate and undergraduate students

VI.

Number of union representatives:

Non-Public:	126
SUNY:	36
CUNY:	46
	208 people

VII. Number of proposals:

	Non Public	SUNY	CUNY	TOTALS
a. with union involvement	81	25	22	128

	Non Public	SUNY	CUNY	TOTALS
b. with union involvement but no specified number of representatives	22	18	2	42
c.[2] with no union involvement	13	8	3	24
TOTALS	116	51	27	194 proposal

[2]includes: letters or no evidence in proposal

III. Disruption Statements[3]

Non-Public: 52 proposals

SUNY: 6 proposals

CUNY: 11 proposals

[3]Either submitted with proposal or as a separate statement from college or school district or teachers/union.

IX. The number of proposals which include agreements on terms and conditions of employment.

Non-Public: 29 of 116 or 25%

SUNY: 13 of 51 or 25.4%

CUNY: 2 of 27 or 7.4%

X. Summary of statements concerned with "terms and conditions of employment" (from generalized to more specific statements).

Non-Public: 18 proposals state to be defined
4 proposals state "traditional contract provisions"
12 proposals state "tuition waivers"
3 proposals state released time for teachers
4 proposals state $8.25 an hour beyond the normal contract
4 proposals provide free library use

1 proposal states college will temporarily pay substitute teacher salaries
1 proposal states teachers will be paid $7.00 an hour

SUNY:
1 proposal states "as specified in local contracts"
8 proposals state "tuition waivers"
1 proposal states "college will pay teachers"
2 proposals state there will be compensation for teachers
6 proposals state to be further defined

CUNY:
2 proposals state "to be defined"
1 proposal states "released time for consortium meetings"
1 proposal states "funds should be made available"
1 proposal states "tuition waiver for teachers"

XI. The number of proposals which grant specific veto power to any or all agencies.

Non-Public: 18 proposals

SUNY: 9 proposals

CUNY: 2 proposals

XII. The substance of involvement in admission to student teaching.

Non-Public:
3 proposals - consortium effort
4 proposals - to be defined
109 proposals - college only[4]

SUNY:
2 proposals - to be defined
49 proposals - college only[4]

CUNY:
2 proposals - consortium effort
25 proposals - college only[4]

[4]where applicable

XIII. The substance of involvement in recommending for certification.

Non-Public:
12 proposals - joint effort of the consortium
6 proposals - college has final consideration, but, it is based on reports from the school district and cooperating teachers
6 proposals - to be defined
92 proposals - college only

SUNY:
51 proposals - college only

CUNY:
2 proposals - college has final consideration, but it is based on reports from the school district and cooperating teachers.
25 proposals - college only

IV. The stated roles and responsibilities of implementation of the CBTE program.

Non-Public:	92 proposals - traditional[5]
	15 proposals - nothing specified
	9 proposals - to be defined
SUNY:	43 proposals - traditional[5]
	5 proposals - nothing specified
	3 proposals - to be defined
CUNY:	16 proposals - traditional[5]
	11 proposals - nothing specified

[5]traditional reflects:
- -Institutions of higher education: provides instruction, facilities, support services, evaluates program
- -School District: provides facilities and evaluates CBTE program
- -Teachers: works with and evaluates student teacher, evaluates CBTE program

---

XV. The substance of protection clauses (from generalized to more specific statements)

Non-Publics:	94 proposals - nothing specified
	13 proposals - to be defined
	7 proposals - no violation of existing policies will be recommended
	1 proposal - will not interfere with the teacher's implementation of the curriculum
	1 proposal - evaluation procedures will not be used to evaluate current employees
SUNY:	43 proposals - nothing specified
	1 proposal - to be defined
	7 proposals - no violation of existing policies will be recommended
CUNY:	23 proposals - nothing specified
	2 proposals - to be defined
	2 proposals - no violation of existing policies will be recommended

---

XVI. Substance of due process clause for students (from generalized to more specific statements)

Non-Public:	93 proposals - nothing specified
	2 proposals - to be defined
	16 proposals - an appeals procedure exists
	5 proposals - a list of educational rights exists

SUNY: 49 proposals - nothing specified
2 proposals - a list of educational rights exists

CUNY: 15 proposals - nothing specified
10 proposals - appeals procedure exists
2 proposals - a list of educational rights exists

XVII. Substance of agreements about who evaluates student teaching

Non-Public: 1 proposal - nothing specified
1 proposal - to be defined
68 proposals - joint effort between college supervisor and cooperating teacher
11 proposals - joint effort among college supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher
35 proposals - college only

SUNY: 2 proposals - nothing specified
2 proposals - to be defined
37 proposals - joint effort between college supervisor and cooperating teacher
10 proposals - college only

CUNY: 8 proposals - joint effort between college supervisor and coopeating teacher
19 proposals - college only

XVIII. The substance of reservations in collaborative statements

Non-Public: 6 proposals - nothing specified
11 proposals - conditions of employment
9 proposals - excessive demands on resources and finances
30 proposals - internal disputes
59 proposals - NYSUT reservations
1 proposal - need for protective clause

SUNY: 26 proposals - nothing specified
3 proposals - conditions of employment
7 proposals - excessive demands on resources and finances
13 proposals - internal disputes
2 proposals - NYSUT reservation

CUNY: 2 proposals - nothing specified
2 proposals - conditions of employment
2 proposals - excessive demands in resources and finance
11 proposals - internal disputes
20 proposals - NYSUT reservations